UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,039	06/02/2001	Sanjay Lal	4906.P079	4242

			EXAMINER
8791	7590	04/02/2004	PUENTE, EMERSON C

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2113	

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *2 June 2001*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☒ Claim(s) *5-16 and 35-46* is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4 and 17-34* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date __4__.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is made Non-Final. Claims 1-46 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3,4,31,33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over US Patent No. 6,611,848 of Bradley in view of US Patent No. 5,825,782 of Roohparvar.

In regards to claim 1 and 31, Bradley discloses:

generating a first command for a set of network data to be executed on a local memory.

Bradley discloses user A making change to file A (see column 2 lines 45-50);

executing a second command for the set of network data on a remote memory in response

to generation of the first command. When user A tries to make changes to file A and file A is

locked, then user B is making changes to a copy of file A in user B's memory, indicating

executing a second command for the set of network data on a remote memory in response to

generation of the first command (see column 2 lines 40-50)

executing the first command on the local memory upon determining the second command

is executed successfully. When file A is unlocked, user A is able to make changes to file A (see

column 2 lines 50-55).

However, Bradley fails to disclose:

determining whether the second command has been executed successfully on the remote memory;

generating an error upon determining the second command is not executed successfully.

Roohparvar discloses setting a status register bit indicating unsuccessful completion, indicating determining whether the second command has been executed successfully on the remote memory and generating an error upon determining the second command is not executed successfully.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to set a status register bit indicating unsuccessful completion, indicating determining whether the second command has been executed successfully on the remote memory and generating an error upon determining the second command is not executed successfully. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated because Bradley discloses maintaining consistent data (see column 2 lines 40-50), and having a status register bit indicating unsuccessful completion indicates to the user a success operation, thus consistent data, or failed operation, thus inconsistent data, as per teaching of Roohparvar (see column 6 lines 65-67).

In regards to claim 3 and 33, Bradley discloses:

wherein the first command is a write command to an address of the local memory and the second command is a write command to an address of the remote memory (see column 5 lines 50-51).

In regards to claim 4 and 34, Bradley discloses:

wherein the first command is a delete command for an address of the local memory and

the second command is a delete command for an address of the remote memory (see column 5

lines 50-51).

Claims 2 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § **103(a)** as being unpatentable over

Bradley in view of Roohparvar in view of US Patent No. 5954,829 of McLain, Jr. et al., referred

hereinafter "McLain".

In regards to claim 2 and 32, Bradley in view of Roohparvar fails to explicitly disclose:

wherein the set of network data is a set of configurations.

However, Bradley discloses wherein a file is broadly defined to include a data file (see

column 3 lines 45-50)

McLain discloses configuration file as a data file (see column 5 lines 10-20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have a configuration file, indicating the set of network data is a set of

configurations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated because Bradley

discloses wherein a file is broadly defined to include a data file (see column 3 lines 45-50) and a

configuration file constitutes a data file, as per teaching of McLain (see column 5 lines 10-20).

Claims 17-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § **103(a)** as being unpatentable over US Patent

No. 5,909,574 of Meyer in view of McLain.

In regards to claim 17, Meyer discloses:

an interface (see figure 6 item 212 and column 6 lines 45-50);

a first control card coupled to the interface, the first control card having a first memory. Meyer discloses a buffer system, which is within the shared memory (see column 6 lines 48-50) and further discloses a shared memory module as shared memory card (see column 6 line 29);

a second control card coupled to the interface and the first control card. Meyer discloses a scatchpad memory which is within the shared memory (see column 6 lines 48-50) and further discloses a shared memory module as shared memory card (see column 6 line 29);

the second control card to receive the set of data from the interface, to generate a set of commands for the set of data, to execute the set of commands on the first memory in response to an exception. Meyer discloses data buffered by exception handler to the scratchpad memory, indicating an exception, to a scatchpad (see column 9 lines 15-25).

to execute the set of commands on a second memory of the second control card (see column 10 lines 11-12).

However, Meyer fails to disclose wherein the data is configurations.

McLain discloses configurations as data (see column 5 lines 10-20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made wherein the data is configurations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated because Meyer discloses data and configurations constitute a data, as per teaching of McLain (see column 5 lines 10-20).

In regards to claim 18, Meyer discloses:

wherein the first memory and the second memory are a first main memory and a second main memory (see column 6 lines 55-60 and column 7 line 32-35).

In regards to claim 19, Meyer discloses:

wherein the first memory and the second memory are a first storage and a second storage

(see column 6 lines 45-50).

In regards to claim 20, Meyer discloses:

wherein the first memory is mapped into the second memory (see column 9 lines 34-38).

In regards to claim 21, Meyer disclose:

the second control card to generate an error if the set of commands are not executed

successfully on the first memory (see column 9 lines 40-45).

In regards to claim 22, Meyer discloses:

wherein the set of commands are a set of write commands (see figure 6 and column 6

lines 45-50).

In regards to claim 23, Meyer discloses:

wherein the set of commands are a set of delete commands. Meyer disclose an overwrite,

indicating deleting previously written data (see figure 6).

In regards to claim 24, Meyer discloses an apparatus comprising:

a processor (see column 3 lines 10-20);

a first memory coupled to the processor, the processor to perform the set of requests on

the first memory in response to an exception triggered by the set of requests. Meyer discloses

data buffered by exception handler to the scratchpad memory, indicating an exception, to a

scatchpad (see column 9 lines 15-25).

a second memory coupled to the first memory and the processor, the processor to perform

a set of requests on the second memory if the set of requests are performed successfully

on the first memory (see column 9 lines 35-40).

Meyer further discloses a processor executing a data process, the data process to receive a

set of data, process the set of data, and to submit a set of requests to the processor (see column 9

lines 15-40);

However, Meyer fails to discloses configurations process..

McLain discloses configurations as data, indicating a configuration process (see column 5

lines 10-20)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made wherein the data is configurations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated because Meyer discloses data and configurations constitute a data, as per

teaching of McLain (see column 5 lines 10-20).

In regards to claim 25, Meyer discloses:

wherein the first memory and the second memory are a first main memory and a second

main memory (see column 6 lines 55-60 and column 7 line 32-35).

In regards to claim 26, Meyer discloses:

wherein the first memory and the second memory are a first storage and a second storage

(see column 6 lines 45-50).

In regards to claim 27, Meyer discloses:

wherein the set of requests are a set of write commands (see figure 6 and column 6 lines

45-50).

In regards to claim 28, Meyer discloses:

wherein the set of requests are a set of delete commands. Meyer disclose an overwrite, indicating deleting previously written data (see figure 6).

In regards to claim 29, Meyer disclose the processor to generate an error if the set of requests are not performed on the first memory successfully (see column 9 lines 40-45).

In regards to claim 30, Meyer discloses:

a second processor coupled to the first processor, the first memory, and the second memory (see column 1 lines 10-22).

Examiner's Statement of Reason for Allowance

Claims 5-16 and 35-46 are allowable

The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 5,12, 35, and 42 are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art, found any motivation to combine any of the said prior arts.

The reason for allowance for claim 5 is the inclusion of triggering an exception when beginning to execute the set of commands on the first memory, wherein the exception performs executing the set of commands on the secondary memory in response to the exception in conjunction with the rest of the limitation set forth in the claim.

The reason for allowance for claim 12 and 42 is the inclusion of generating an exception when the configuration data located at the local address in the local memory is attempted to be modified, wherein the exception performs, within a processor in the active control card, modifying configuration data located at a remote address in remote memory in an inactive

control card, wherein the configuration data located at the local address corresponds to the

configuration data located at the remote address in response to the exception in conjunction with

the rest of the limitation set forth in the claim.

The reason for allowance for claim 35 is the inclusion of triggering an exception when

processing the set of commands for the first memory, wherein the exception performs executing

the commands on the second memory in conjunction with the rest of the limitation set forth in

the claim.

The remaining claims, not specifically mentioned, are allowed because they are

dependent upon one of the claim mentioned above.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the

payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue

fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled"Comments on Statement of Reasons for

Allowance".

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

See Form PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Emerson C Puente whose telephone number is (703) 305-8012.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robert W Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Emerson Puente
3/30/04

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100